



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,433	08/07/2003	William J. Aldrich	MWS-059	2610

959 7590 04/05/2007
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER

THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/637,433

Applicant(s)

ALDRICH, WILLIAM J.

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2179

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Non-provisional application filed 08/07/2003.
2. Claims 1 -24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

With regard to **claims 23-24**, the computer-program product thus defined in the specification includes intangible media such as a " **propagated signal**" (Page 6, Para 1, lines 1-12) that renders the claims non-statutory subject matter. The present application specification, as noted above, sets forth evidence that the computer program product is intended to include items, which one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized as propagation or transmission media, which is a form of energy. Therefore, consistent with MPEP 2106, the claimed subject matter is not currently believed to be limited to that which falls within a statutory category of invention. because it is not limited to a process, machine, manufacture, or a composition of matter. Instead, it includes a form of energy.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-7, 10, 12-17, 21, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Belcsak et al (hereinafter Belcsak) US. Patent no. 6,957,191 issued Oct. 18, 2005 and filed Sept. 14, 2000.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Belcsak teaches a method comprising:

- Performing an analysis or synthesis operation on a graphical model representation (See column 2, 55-67 and column 3, lines 1-35). Belcsak teaches a process of performing an analysis on a graphical model.
- Producing a report from the analysis or synthesis operation (column 7, lines 60-67 and column 16, lines 16-50). Belcsak teaches producing a report from the analysis of the model.
- Generating associations representing elements of the graphical model representation with corresponding elements in the report (column 9, lines 35-67). Belcsak teaches that each item on the diagram have associations within the model and correspond to elements of the report.

Art Unit: 2179

With respect to **dependent claim 2**, Belcsak teaches the method in which the report is a document structured with portions corresponding to different elements of the graphical model representation (column 9, lines 15-30 and column 16, lines 16-50).

With respect to **dependent claim 3**, Belcsak teaches the method in which the document is a structural coverage report (Belcsak column 16, lines 15-50). Belcsak shows the report covers the foundation of the financial model and how it is calculated, which covers how the structure of a financial transaction is executed between two parties.

With respect to **dependent claim 4**, Belcsak teaches the method in which the document is a code generation report incorporating syntax highlighted code (column 13, lines 5-10). Belcsak teaches the code is generated in a report (See figure 21).

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Belcsak teaches the method in which the document is a profiling report that documents relative execution times of each of the elements (Belcsak column 10, line 11-45). Belcsak teaches a process of entering the execution time of the financial model which corresponds to payments that flow from the parties. The longer the payment period will cause a longer execution time of the lease.

With respect to **dependent claims 6-7**, Belcsak teaches the method further comprising loading an element in the report in response to activating a graphical object on the graphical model representation and activating with a mouse (column 9, lines 30-67). Belcsak teaches the users can drag-n-drop new elements to be added to the model. The drag operation is performed using an input tool

With respect to **dependent claim 10**, Belcsak teaches the method in which the report is a model coverage report (See figure 21 and column 16, lines 15-50). Belcsak teaches the entire model structure is covered in the reports generated by the system (See also column 7, lines 60-67).

In regard to **Claims 12-17, and 21**, claims 12, 14-17, and 21 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions for performing the steps of method claims 1, 2-5, and 10 respectively, and in

Art Unit: 2179

further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale. Belcsak teaches that the elements of the graphical model can be loaded and changed by the user as selected within the interface (See example Figures 15-21). Belcsak also teaches the means within a system for displaying in an interface a graphical model that the user designs and from the model an analysis is run to determine the outcome of a financial transaction. Belcsak teaches that reports are generated that show the different sections of the transaction and the reports show the code in which the model was executed in the interface.

The examiner notes the support in the specification for the program product on page 6 of the specification.

In regard to **Independent claim 23**, Belcsak teaches the computer program product residing on a computer readable medium having instructions stored thereon which, when executed a processor, cause the processor to:

- Perform an analysis or synthesis operation on a graphical model representation (See column 2, 55-67 and column 3, lines 1-35). Belcsak teaches a process of performing an analysis on a graphical model.
- Produce a report from the analysis or synthesis operation (column 7, lines 60-67 and column 16, lines 16-50). Belcsak teaches producing a report from the analysis of the model.
- Generate associations representing elements of the graphical model representation with corresponding elements in the report (column 9, lines 35-67). Belcsak teaches that each item on the diagram have associations within the model and correspond to elements of the report.

With respect to **dependent claim 24**, Belcsak teaches the product further having instructions to cause the processor to load an element in the report in response to activating a graphical object in the graphical model representation (See column 20, lines 25-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 8-9, 11, 18-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belcsak et al (hereinafter Belcsak) US. Patent no. 6,957,191 issued Oct. 18, 2005 and filed Sept. 14, 2000, in view of Weinman (hereinafter Weinman) U.S. Patent No. 6,339,838 issued Jan. 15, 2002 and filed Jan. 2, 1998.**

With respect to **dependent claims 8-9, 11, 18-20, and 22** as indicated in the above discussion Belcsak teaches every limitation of claim 1.

Belcsak teaches that the system is a web-based platform, which would provide the structure to have a web page and the elements of the graphical model rendered in a browser. Belcsak also teaches that a report is generated for each of the sections of the model.

Belcsak does not provide a specific example where the individual associations within the reports are markup tags and that the tags are HTML tags and that the report that is generated is a generated code report.

However, in the same problem area of automatically generating reports from graphical models, Weinman teaches a process of using software generation tools extracted from a graphical model where the model elements are expressed as HTML elements and tags (See column 10, lines 40-50 and column 13, lines 15-67 and column 14, lines 1-31). Further, Weinman teaches the code generated by the system changes are then fed into the model and displayed on the interface to aid the user in determining if the model parameters achieve the desired outcome (See column 2,

Art Unit: 2179

lines 35-67 and column 7, lines 50-67). Belcsak and Weinman both teach a process of allowing a user to model a process graphically and then running processing on the model and allowing the user to view the results or outcome of a simulated process.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, having the teachings of Belcsak and Weinman in front of them, to modify the system of Belcsak to include the associations as HTML tags and to produce a code report showing the underlying structure of the HTML report document. The motivation to combine Weinman with Belcsak comes from the suggestion in Weinman that modeling or studying a process comes from the steps of capturing, describing, and then documenting in **some selected** language the process under consideration and then using the software model in the computers that are modeling the process such as HTML objects in a browser (See column 1, lines 25-35 and column 2, lines 19-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 20**, as indicated in the above discussion, Belcsak in the view of Weinman teaches each limitation of claim 18.

Belcsak teaches that general formatting and cosmetic formatting capabilities are provided in similar to commercially provided word processing and spreadsheet applications(See column 17, lines 15-25).

Belcsak does not expressly teach a system in which the markup language tags are portable document format (PDF) embedded links. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Weinman, because Weinman teaches that a variety of software code generation tool formats can be utilized to display graphical objects and their graphical properties in the display, which would include HTML element and PDF elements as PDF is a type of word processing application.

Art Unit: 2179

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6160549 to Touma, which discloses a process of generating a report from a declarative model of graphical objects and running simulation on the configured model.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER